LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1317
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Meaning of the U. S. Constitution

Nicholas Murray Butler

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1317
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Meaning of the U. S. Constitution

Nicholas Murray Butler
(President of Columbia University)

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1928.
Haldeman-Julius Company

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

Page

The Meaning of the U. S. Constitution..... 5
Literature of the Constitution.....23
The Candidates, *E. Haldeman-Julius*.....28
Address of a Candidate for Governor in the South, *Sanford Jarrell* 42
Is Republican Government Breaking Down in America? *Clay Fulks*.....53

THE MEANING OF THE U. S. CONSTITUTION

Interest in the Constitution of the United States has been measurably increased in recent years.

The following article, by Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, discusses the Constitution, 140 years after, and emphasizes among other things the importance of public opinion in making the Constitution a living thing.

To the full understanding of the Constitution of the United States there is one thing more important than the Constitution itself, and that is the body of political philosophy and political doctrine which underlies the Constitution and which is the foundation on which the Constitution rests. Just 140 years ago the Constitution and its underlying political philosophy were being vigorously debated in the conventions that were called to meet in the several States to pass upon its ratification. The really eminent men who sat in the Constitutional Convention itself and who were found in no small number in the several State conventions, had a

knowledge of political philosophy and an insight into the significance and history of political institutions which excite our admiration and wonder as we read its manifold evidences.

These nation builders were of one mind in that they were concerned with government as an instrument of liberty and not with government as a substitute for liberty. The Constitution would never have been ratified, or if it had been would have drifted quickly on the rocks of disaster, had not the Bill of Rights been promptly incorporated in it as the first Ten Amendments. For all practical purposes these Ten Amendments are to be regarded as part of the original Constitution; only in form were they an afterthought. In essence and in principle they were taken for granted by every one.

HOW LIBERTY IS PRESERVED

The preservation and the protection of liberty are the most difficult and unending of tasks in the history of human society. Liberty cannot be preserved and protected by Government, but only through the requirement, enforced by an alert and emphatic public opinion, that Government shall mind its own business.

The Constitution of the United States explicitly delimits the sphere of action for that

Government which it sets up. The monumental judicial interpretations of John Marshall cleared up not a few doubts and obscurities. The war between the States did the rest and there is now, with the single exception of the Eighteenth Amendment and its subject matter, a clearer and more definite understanding of the political philosophy which underlies the Constitution than has ever been the case before. The strict constructionist and the liberal constructionist have to all intents and purposes joined forces. The work of Hamilton and that of Jefferson are now seen to have been not so much antagonistic as complementary, the one to the other.

Hamilton, with his unerring sagacity, speaking before the convention called to meet at Poughkeepsie to ratify the Constitution on behalf of the State of New York, said on June 21, 1788:

"All Governments, even the most despotic, depend, in a great degree, on opinion. In free republics, it is most peculiarly the case. In these, the will of the people makes the essential principle of the Government; and the laws which control the community receive their tone and spirit from the public wishes."

This is equivalent to saying that the Ninth

and Tenth Amendments are the most important and the most fundamental part of the Constitution of the United States. This is profoundly true, and is something upon which public opinion should increasingly dwell and increasingly reflect.

It must not be forgotten that in the constitutional law of England and of France there is no formal provision for civil liberty apart from governmental action. Every particle of civil liberty in both national systems is at all times at the mercy of government. The advantage, as we think, of the Constitution of the United States is that civil liberty precedes government and underlies it, and is expressly protected by the organized state from government; unless government shall find a way to override the limitations which free men have put upon it.

All government tends to magnify its own importance and its own authority. No public body in the world is so vain as the Senate of the United States, or so given to self-laudation. It has successfully invaded the powers of the executive, the powers of the House of Representatives and the powers of the judiciary. It has just now in effect amended the Constitution of the United States itself in respect to the composition of the Senate, under a construction of

its own authority, which can only be described as revolutionary.

The tendency of every bureaucrat in Washington to extend the sphere of his authority to pry into and supervise purely private concerns and to build up rigid and intolerable administrative devices, is all part of the same process. Effective resistance to these slow and subtle revolutions in government can only be made by an alert, a well informed and a courageous public opinion.

QUALITIES OF ITS AUTHORS

Looking back over the whole period of 140 years, it is little short of marvelous how well the Constitution of the United States has worked. The men who made it were well described by the Rev. Mr. Thatcher of Dedham, speaking in the Massachusetts convention on Feb. 4, 1788:

"A constitution hath been presented to us which was composed and planned by men who, in the council and field, have in the most conspicuous offices served their country in the late war. It comes authenticated by a man who, without any pecuniary reward, commanded our army and who retired to a private station with more pleasure than he left it."

The Constitution was as much the product of

unselfish and devoted patriotic service as it was of large and fine ability and knowledge.

It is the complete departure from the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and not at all the subject matter with which it deals, that makes the Eighteenth Amendment so objectionable and so offensive to every one who understands American government and who believes in it. The incorporation in the Constitution for the first time of definitive legislation and the attempted transfer, by amendment, to the Federal Government of the police power of the States, which cannot be taken away without shaking the very foundation of the Constitution itself, are the real cause of the nation-wide dissatisfaction and revolt against the Eighteenth Amendment and the legislation built upon it. The fundamental point at issue is one of government and nothing else.

There are two ways in which the Constitution may be brought to nought. The one is by depriving the constituent States of their authority and powers; the other is by weakening the Federal Government to a point where it could not effectively represent the nation and deal directly with those matters of national interest that were committed to it by the Constitution.

The experience of 140 years shows clearly

that the pendulum of tendency and of opinion swings first one way and then the other. Jackson found it swinging toward disintegration and peremptorily stopped it. Lincoln was face to face with the same movement on a far larger and more awesome scale.

In recent years the contrary tendency has been more in evidence. Individuals, groups, propagandists of every sort and kind have been running to Washington and beseiging the Congress to find ways and means to pull their particular chestnuts out of the fire. Proposals are constantly made in either house of the Congress for action by government which make even the most absurd of those that are undertaken seem cautious and conservative by comparison.

EXPRESSION OF PUBLIC OPINION

No form of political organization and no social order will look after itself. Public opinion is the source of safety, as it is the origin of progress. A real difficulty in the operation of our form of government is found in the fact that true public opinion so rarely reaches Washington, the capital city. Very seldom can it break through the barriers erected against it by selfishness, greed, local interest, special and

highly organized propaganda, personal ambition and lust of place and power.

Our system of representative government does not work practically as in theory it was intended to do. A Senator when chosen from a State becomes, in theory, a Senator of the United States and the whole people are his constituents. His eye, however, is almost always fastened upon that portion of the nation which has immediately to do with his election, and he becomes much more a Senator of, from and for a given State than a Senator of the United States from that given State which elects him.

The men in representative office who are capable of taking a truly national view are few and far between. The number who have the courage and the character to sacrifice the probability of re-election in order to take a genuinely national view are not numerous. This is why so many questions which involve truth and falsehood, right and wrong, are disposed of by compromise rather than by settlement in accordance with principle. This is why government drifts from year to year, anxious to avoid taking a definite and constructive stand in respect to matters that are in dispute, instead of boldly representing the peo-

ple's intelligence and the people's conscience and dealing with these matters on grounds of high principle.

When situations like this arise, as they constantly do, it is usual to hear some critic finding fault with the Constitution as the cause of it all. Nothing could be further from the fact. The Constitution is not at fault; it is the people themselves who fail in the working of their Constitution. The responsibility cannot be shifted from public opinion and its effective expression and exercise to the historic document on which our Government so safely and, we trust, permanently rests. If public opinion will be awake, intelligent, earnest and courageous, the Constitution will be found ready to do its part with silent effectiveness.

A noteworthy characteristic of the Constitution is the dignity, the simplicity and the precision of its language. A son of Columbia may be pardoned for justifiable pride in the part which his Alma Mater played in bringing this to pass. On Sept. 8, 1787, the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia concluded its consideration of the provisions of that document and by ballot appointed a Committee on Style and Arrangement to put the document into definite and final form.

THE COMMITTEE ON STYLE

The delegates chosen to serve as members of the Committee on Style and Arrangement were William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut, Alexander Hamilton of New York, Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania, Rufus King of Massachusetts and James Madison of Virginia. Of the five, four were to be, associated intimately with Columbia College, while the fifth, James Madison, was the most eminent graduate of Princeton.

William Samuel Johnson was chosen first President of Columbia College after the Revolution and served as such from 1787 until his resignation in 1800. Alexander Hamilton, most brilliant and distinguished of Columbia men, had entered the college in 1774, but was prevented from graduation by the outbreak of the War of Independence. He served as trustee of Columbia from 1787 until his death in 1804.

Gouverneur Morris had been graduated from old King's College with the class of 1768 and was elected Hamilton's successor as trustee, serving from 1805 until his death in 1816. Rufus King removed his residence to New York and served as trustee from 1806 until his resignation in 1824. He was the father of Charles King, ninth president of Columbia.

Whatever part may have been played by others—and, knowing the men, no one of them would have been a laggard—the controlling part in giving to the Constitution its precise form and style was played by Gouverneur Morris. James Madison testifies explicitly to this fact in a letter addressed by him to Jared Sparks under date of April 8, 1831.

"The finish given to the style and arrangement of the Constitution fairly belongs to the pen of Mr. Morris," wrote Mr. Madison, "the task having, probably, been handed over to him by the Chairman of the committee, himself a highly respectable member, and with the ready concurrence of the others. A better choice could not have been made, as the performance of the task proved. It is true that the state of the materials, consisting of a reported draft in detail, and subsequent resolutions accurately penned, and falling easily into their proper places, was a good preparation for the symmetry, and phraseology of the instrument, but there was sufficient room for the talents and taste stamped by the author on the face of it."

Morris himself had earlier testified to his controlling part in giving to the Constitution its literary form and style in a letter which

he addressed to Timothy Pickering on December 22, 1814:

"What can a history of the Constitution avail toward interpreting its provisions? This must be done by comparing the plain import of the words with the general tenor and object of the instrument. That instrument was written by the fingers which write this letter. Having rejected redundant and equivocal terms, I believed it to be as clear as our language would permit; excepting, nevertheless, a part of what relates to the judiciary. On that subject conflicting opinions had been maintained with so much professional astuteness that it became necessary to select phrases which, expressing my own notions, would not alarm others, nor shock their self-love, and to the best of my recollection, this was the only part which passed without cavil."

The record is plain that five of the ablest and most competent men then living in the Western World, or perhaps anywhere in the world, were in the last instance responsible for the style and finish of a document which has excited the admiration of all men. The Committee on Style and Arrangement reported their draft on Sept. 12, and on Sept. 17 the convention, having made a few amendments,

approved the draft and adjourned sine die. It is then recorded that the "gentlemen of Convention dined together at the City Tavern."

THE DELIGHT OF FRANKLIN

Most students of the Constitution will recall the fine paragraph in Madison's journal of the debates in the convention which records the act of Benjamin Franklin while the last members of the convention were attaching their signatures to the engrossed document:

"Dr. Franklin, looking toward the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him that painters had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun. 'I have,' said he, 'often and often in the course of the session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting: but now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun.'"

Readers and students in search of a clear and philosophic exposition of the body of political philosophy and experience upon which the Constitution rests or with the desire to

know how it is to be compared or contrasted with the constitutions of Great Britain, of France and of the late German Empire, will turn, as they have done for a generation, to the classic work of Professor John W. Burgess entitled "Political Science and Constitutional Law," first published in 1890. On those illuminated and illuminating pages will be found the material for lifelong study and thought as to all that the Constitution involves, as to all that the Constitution means, and as to all that the Constitution preserves and protects.

The rigidity of the Constitution is frequent cause for criticism of it by writers in other parts of the world. Its rigidity, however, is more apparent than real, for political ingenuity and judicial interpretation have brought flexibility and comprehensiveness where rigidity and exclusiveness were thought to dwell.

It is not too much to hope that some day one element of awkwardness and frequent embarrassment in the operation of the Government under the Constitution, due to its sharp separation of powers, will be removed by the very simple device of permitting heads of executive departments to appear at fixed intervals on the floor of the two houses of Congress in order to answer questions and to participate in

discussions that relate to the matters under their immediate administrative charge.

As strong a committee of Senators as could possibly have been appointed, unanimously and without distinction of party, recommended as long ago as 1881 that this course be pursued. We are still waiting for that recommendation to be accepted and the Government to get the benefit of its acceptance.

Undoubtedly the weakest link in the chain of the Constitution is Article V, which provides for the method of its amendment. The provisions of that article as understood by the Constitution makers were entirely becoming and quite adequate. As they have been interpreted, however, by the Congress and by the Supreme Court, they constitute an element of weakness and even of danger.

INTENTIONS AS TO AMENDMENTS

The founders of the Government meant by an amendment an alteration to improve or to perfect some existing provision of the Constitution; it never entered their heads that the word amendment would be construed to include any proposal, however revolutionary, however contradictory to other parts of the Constitution, or however antagonistic to the political philosophy

upon which the Constitution rests. Nevertheless, the constructions which have been made of the power of amendment include all these things.

The result is to bring about a situation under the terms of which the whole fabric of the Government may be altered and destroyed by votes of appropriate majorities of a number of legislative bodies having a total membership of some 4,000, and without any reference to the people of the United States whatsoever. Such a condition needs only to be stated to make its absurdity as a rule of political action patent to everybody. Yet the deed has been done.

As a result, the only protection which the people have is, once more, in their own insight, their own firmness and their own courage. The provision of Article V is perfectly definite that "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution." But the Congress, instead of waiting until it deems it necessary to propose an amendment, has shown itself ready to do so whenever it thinks it politically or personally expedient.

This of itself is a surrender of the power and authority of Congress to the mob. Some day, by constitutional convention or otherwise, the

people must address themselves to curing this greatest of defects which the history of nearly a century and a half has developed in the Constitution and its interpretation.

NOW THE OLDEST GOVERNMENT

It is not always recognized of all great and important Governments now existing in the world that of the United States of America is oldest in form and in structure. The true basis of the Government of Great Britain is to be found in such revolutionary acts as the Reform bill of 1832, the Reform bill of 1867 and the Parliament act of 1911. The Government of the French Republic dates from the end of the Franco-Prussian War. The Governments of Germany, of Italy and of Spain have been made over in recent years as a result of war or of silent revolution. All Governments in Eastern and Central Europe are yet in a state of infancy.

The Constitution of the United States, therefore, is the oldest of them all. Back through the long centuries it traces its history to the instincts and habits and purposes of free men in the forests of Germany and on the friendly soil of the British Isles. Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights and the

Declaration of Independence are the forebears of the Constitution of the United States. The highest public duty of an American is silently to take for himself the oath which the Constitution prescribes to be taken by the President before he enters on the execution of his office: To the best of his ability to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

LITERATURE OF THE CONSTITUTION

THE GROWING LIBRARY OF BOOKS STARTED WITH MADISON'S CONVENTION JOURNAL

James Madison of Virginia, in an inspired moment, set himself the task of keeping for posterity a journal of the daily proceedings of the Federal Convention of 1787, which framed the Constitution of the United States. In doing so he initiated a literature on the Constitution that is steadily growing and already assuming vast proportions.

Since Madison's famous journal the literature on the Constitution has been augmented by various histories and by studies of the charter of the American Government—works prepared by leading authorities both here and abroad. The United States Supreme Court, sitting in continuous judgment, has added historic interpretative decisions. The Government Printing Office has collected and published official papers which, taken together, provide an elaborate documentation.

The United States, otherwise one of the youngest nations, now boasts the oldest Govern-

ment of the kind in existence. The drama inherent in this seniority is the better appreciated through further familiarity with the steps by which this position has been attained. The forces that have contributed in the last 140 years have accordingly begun to function at such depth that the average citizen must depend more and more on their evaluation by recognized students. The list of books on the Constitution herewith given is accordingly designed to help make such reference more convenient:

A Manual of the Constitution—L. S. Andrews.

The Federal Constitution—J. F. Baker.

The History of the Formation of the Constitution—George Bancroft.

The Constitution of the United States—James M. Beck.

The Life of John Marshall—Albert J. Beveridge.

Jefferson and Hamilton—Claude B. Bowers.

Modern Democracies—James Bryce.

The American Commonwealth—James Bryce.

Changes in Constitutional Theory—John W. Burgess.

Our Constitution—A. J. Cloud.

The Constitution and Its Meaning—E. S. Corwin.

General Principles of Constitutional Law in the United States—T. McI. Cooley.

Political Science and Constitutional Law—John W. Burgess.

Constitutional History of the United States—G. T. Curtis.

The United States Constitution—W. F. Dobb.

A Biographical Story of the Constitution—Edward Elliott.

The Framing of the Constitution of the United States—Max Farrand.

Documentary History of the Constitution (1895)—Government Printing Office.

Evolution of the Constitution of the United States—S. G. Fisher.

The Critical Period of American History—John Fiske.

Washington and His Colleagues—Henry Jones Ford.

American Constitutional Law—J. I. E. Hare.

Essay on the Constitutional History of the United States in the Formative Period—J. F. Jameson.

Constitutional and Political History—H. E. Von Holst.

The Life of James Madison—Gaillard Hunt.

The Federalist—Lodge's edition.

The Genesis of the Constitution of the United States—Breckenridge Long.

Confederation and the Constitution—A. C. McLaughlin.

An Introduction to the Study of the Constitution—Charles E. Martin.

Growth of the Constitution in the Federal Convention of 1787—W. M. Meigs.

The Formation and Development of the Constitution—T. F. Moran.

Abraham Lincoln—Nicolay and Hay.

The Constitution: Sources and Application—Thomas J. Norton.

Alexander Hamilton—Frederick G. Oliver.

Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin—James Parton.

Our Changing Constitution—C. W. Pierson.

Majority Rule and the Judiciary—W. L. Ransom.

The Constitution of Our Country—Rexford and Carson.

The Constitution of the United States—Robert L. Schuyler.

The Spirit of American Government—J. A. Smith.

Sources of the Constitution of the United States—C. E. Stevens.

Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States—(House Document No. 398)—Charles C. Tansill, arranger.

A Short Constitutional History of the United States—F. N. Thorpe.

Unwritten Constitution of the United States —C. G. Tiedeman.

The Federal Constitution—Alexis de Tocqueville.

If Hamilton Were Here Today—A. H. Vandenburg.

The Short Constitution—Wade and Russell.

Congress, the Constitution and the Supreme Court—Charles Warren.

The Supreme Court in United States History —Charles Warren.

The Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson—T. E. Watson.

Daniel Webster—E. P. Wheeler.

Constitutional Government in the United States—Woodrow Wilson.

THE CANDIDATES

E. Haldeman-Julius

THE CANDIDATE FOR MAYOR

The reporter had one ambition in life: to get a definite statement, on an important controversial question, from a candidate for office. He had been interviewing candidates for years; by means of indefatigable efforts and ingenious devices he had so far succeeded in winning admissions from some candidates that they *were* candidates; so much had indeed been won with a glow of triumph, but, beyond that, inquiry had been baffled, the drift of these colloquies aimless. True, candidates could be very talkative; often they showed rare powers of conversation, in a dubious and detached way; they were shy, however, on incisive statements of opinion. Seemingly, they felt that the voters knew best what opinions should be held on pressing public, political questions; as candidates for office in a democracy, they believed thoroughly in the people's supremacy, which included a belief that only the people might safely and properly have opinions. The people will decide—let the people debate—was the candidatorial theory that prevailed regardless of personal temperaments and party affiliations. To be sure, a candidate should have something to say; he should let the people know where he stood—*i. e.*, as a man, a patriot, and a Christian; but the main, indefinite idea was that the best man should win.

In judging the best man, various and curious criteria were available. When Colonel Gordon,

the auctioneer, ran for sheriff he put the matter squarely before the voters in this fashion: being a very large, commanding figure of a man, wearing a wide Western hat, he adorned the country with pictures of himself, carrying the slogan: "Vote For the Man Who Looks Like a Sheriff." A candidate for county treasurer recommended himself as one who had been successful in the butcher trade. A candidate for district judge was supported on the ground that he would appear always dignified on the bench and would uphold the tradition of John Marshall. A candidate for county attorney proclaimed his fitness for the office with this slogan: "The Best Defender Will Make the Best Prosecutor"; in a word, easily freed, easily convicted. It was considerably in the favor of any candidate for any office that he had no criminal record. Honest men; fathers of families; respectable citizens; members of churches; true Americans—such were the men who, on the strength of such qualifications, offered themselves for judgment to the voters.

But the reporter had found the mental processes of candidates (save as they reflected the aforementioned qualifications) inaccessibly private. In their character as plain, true-hearted citizens, they would talk freely; as responsible candidates, however, they would not use that reponsibility to prejudice the voters on any vital, debatable issue. The reporter was an optimist, and he was still interviewing candidates with an ill-defined but faintly stirring hope.

For some months it had been well known that Dodge would run for mayor of Westville. Not that Dodge had recklessly made a statement to that effect; but somehow he was talked

about in this connection, probably through the influence of his friends. It is a political axiom that no man can be a candidate unless he has friends: otherwise, he is placed in an intolerably exposed position of personal responsibility. The friends of Dodge, then, were so far responsible for his candidacy in a general way. His friends had opinions, although they did not commit Dodge; if these opinions were of advantage to him, it must be assumed that he was grateful; if they proved embarrassing, what man more innocent than he? When the reporter questioned him about the opinion of some of his friends concerning the management of the city light plant, Dodge was prompt to plainly say: "Well, now, I appreciate the support of my friends—good, honest fellows—I can't be responsible for everything they say. We don't, perhaps, think alike on all questions. There's Bill Jones—ha, ha—he and I don't agree on the best places to go fishing. Of course" (he added, on a more serious note) "I believe Westville should have the very best light service." Dodge paused thoughtfully, then he essayed to be facetious in the approved manner of a Christian man: "Remember, God said, 'Let there be light.'" Having brilliantly aligned himself with God on this question, Dodge would say no more.

Westville is large enough to have quite a small police force; and there is some complaint that the police are negligent, especially with bootleggers, who constitute the city's chief criminal problem. The reporter wanted to know what Dodge thought about the conduct of the police. Did he think something was wrong, and, if so, what was the remedy? The candidate for mayor deliberately lit a cigar—puffed—squinted reflectively—gazed out of the

window and remarked that it was a real spring day. He then leaned boldly toward his questioner and, tapping his desk firmly with a pencil, said: "I believe in the enforcement of the laws. And what would Westville be without churches?" This was a promising vein of thought. "I have often wondered," he went on, "how the man who denounces the church would like to live in a town without churches. Churches and schools—I am proud of Westville, because it has churches and schools. And say" (he added, showing that although a politician he was human after all) "won't the children be glad to know that vacation is so near?" Dodge beamed, and the kindly creases of his countenance seemed to announce the slogan: "You Can Trust the Man Who Loves Children."

There has been talk (perhaps inspired by the example of Chicago) of some restrictions on parking along Westville's main street; but on this issue Dodge maintained a discreet reticence. He did, however, permit himself to comment on the automobile as a factor in modern progress. The country, he declared, could not manage in this day and age without the automobile. Now that we have automobiles, America is pleasanter and busier. "The automobile," he said sententiously, "has brought us all closer together." Dodge also expressed his approval of the law, passed by the legislature in the state of New York, forbidding anyone to run an airplane while intoxicated.

Concerning the proposal, on which opinions differ sharply, that certain streets in Westville should be paved, Dodge could not be brought to talk. The most he would say was: "I am for anything that is good for the town." He did believe (so much he would say in confidence) that good roads should be encouraged

throughout the state as a whole. He even criticized, in direct and unequivocal terms, the county that adjoins West county on the north for delaying its part in the construction of a highway running from Westville to Kansas City. "It's a shame," he cried, "that we should still have to struggle through ten miles of muddy road. The highway should have been completed a year ago. Our county has done its duty."

The candidate for mayor was a trifle more communicative on state issues. He condemned, for example, the granting of too many paroles and pardons by the governor. He felt that he could properly say that criminals should not be coddled. Quite voluntarily he offered an opinion on national politics, namely, that it would be a good thing to restrict immigration from Mexico. He also thought that "our boys" were only doing their duty in Nicaragua; and that the oil investigation was interesting, to say the least, although it was more a question of honesty than politics; while as for the wet and dry issue—"Well, that is a national issue. And we in Westville are good Americans."

It was apparent that Dodge was a right-minded citizen. The reporter still hoped to get some definite, even though slight, expression of that mind. He made a final inquiry: "May I quote you, Mr. Dodge, as being definitely in the race for mayor?" The candidate exhibited an air of doubt, hesitation, mystery. He mentioned the fact that the days were longer now, and that Westville's fine new golf course would soon be very much in use. Then he said, in a tone of ringing frankness: "I believe in the good old principle that the office should seek the man instead of the man seeking the office. If I am a candidate—mind you,

if I am—it is only that I would not refuse any public duty. Further than that, I can only say that I appreciate the interest of my friends, and" (he smiled genially, if a bit wistfully) "I hope that everybody in Westville is my friend."

THE CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR

Candidates for mayor, the reporter told himself, are perhaps careful in their talk from a sense of neighborliness. As Dodge knew and daily met everyone in Westville, he might be excused for not wishing to offend fellow townsmen with whom, being so intimately in contact, he felt a greater individual sense of responsibility. The private and public life of Dodge were too closely related, which might well induce a feeling of polite, personal restraint. One does not like to thrust one's opinions upon one's friends nor to mar social intercourse with the acrimony of dispute. Men higher up—men whose field is broader, whose duty and significance are more beholden to impersonal principles—should respond more freely, as genuine *public men*, to the discussion of issues. They should be less hampered by personal obligations and contacts and more at home with issues in a large, statesmanlike sense. And obviously a candidate for governor has a wider range of relevant opinion than a candidate for mayor.

The opinions of Blank, the candidate for governor, did indeed range far and wide, being extremely remote from all questions that agitated the state. There is the demand that cities with more than a hundred thousand population should enjoy home rule. There are three large cities in Blank's state that are strongly claiming this autonomy, and in these cities the vote

is heavy; but the state is largely a farming state, with rural interests and small-town sentiment predominating. It would doubtless be the more popular policy, as a choice between the two, for Blank to declare himself definitely against city home rule; but that is not necessary and he does not conceive it to be right; he is fond of saying that he aspires to be the governor of the whole state, wherefore he would not seek to bring prejudice upon this or other grave, delicate issues. Still, he would not be thought of as avoiding the issue. He explained his position to the reporter in these words: "We must concede that there are city problems and country problems; just as there are state problems and national problems; just as there are national problems and international problems. Yes, it is natural that the cities should want a freer hand; but it is also indicative of good citizenship that the people on the farms and in the smaller towns should think of the interests of the state as a whole. I think, after all, that the most important thing is that the people should rule. We should study the points on which we agree rather than the points on which we differ. I am sure that we all agree in upholding the right and wisdom of *popular government*. In the words of Lincoln, 'Breathes there a man with soul so dead who never to himself hath said government of the people, by the people and for the people'?"

On the Chinese, Russian and Egyptian questions, Blank expressed himself more positively, though not very much more clearly. "What China needs," he said, "is democracy and Christianity; it also needs honest, patriotic leaders who see their duty and are not afraid to do it. Russia will never amount to anything so long

as the Bolsheviks are in control. No country can succeed with a policy that denies the essential rights of private property. Russia needs a Coolidge." (Blank's state is overwhelmingly Republican.) "Egypt needs time in which to develop civilization; it should appreciate the benefits of English-speaking government." He was also frank in asserting that the Monroe Doctrine should be upheld. On Prohibition he could, being advantageously situated in a dry (opinioned) state, speak boldly and briefly: "Prohibition isn't a *question* in this state. It's a *fact*." He believes, of course, that the federal government should do something for the farmers; he would not say that it should do this or that in particular, but it should promote the best interests of the "stalwart sons of the soil." (Blank is proud of this last, an original phrase.)

Taxation is a lively issue in Blank's state, and the reporter was hopeful that a definite statement would be forthcoming on this issue. It seemed a plain question: Did Blank think that taxes should be lowered or not? Particularly, did he think (as was being alleged) that the corporations bore an unjustly light burden of the state taxation? Blank looked at the ceiling seriously and cleared his throat in a profound and decisive manner. He said: "It is a question of bookkeeping. Here we must realize that figures are more important than theories. Are taxes too high? That is the question. *Are* they? *If* they are, they should be lowered if that can be done without prejudice to the pride and prosperity of the state. I personally rejoice to see the citizens interested in economy of government; we do not want wealth to accumulate and men to decay, as Patrick Henry put it—no, we do not want

that. We should reflect, however, that our state is celebrated nationally for its good roads, its schools, its homes, its high birth rate and low death rate, its traffic laws, its corn crop, and its *per capita* ownership of bath-tubs. Do we want to keep this fine record? I believe that we do. Yet this matter of taxation should be carefully studied. We want to strike the golden mean, as the philosophers say, between keeping taxes down and keeping expenses up. Corporations—well, they should obey the law of course. It is my theory that corporations should be treated with the same strict and even-handed justice as individuals. Personally, I am sure that the interstate commerce commission in Washington is in the main a very useful body. We want more factories in the state, but we must remember that the soil is the sustaining source of our social life." (This last is another bit of brightly blooming oratory that Blank loves to flourish.)

On the subject of disarmament, Blank spoke readily: "A Christian statesman must certainly favor peace. The last war was quite destructive. It would be too bad if we were to have another war on the same scale. Disarmament is right, if it is done in the right way. No country, of course, should be left unprotected. National defense is a sacred duty, but international warfare is a calamity. Certainly, the interests of the state are bound up with the interests of the nation. I believe in an *American* policy on this as on all other questions."

Asked if he were a candidate for governor, Blank stood with bowed head and reverently replied: "That is a matter of opinion. If you mean, would I feel proud to be the governor of this great state, that is a feeling which, I am safe in saying, I share with every honest

citizen." And as the reporter reached for his hat, Blank musingly added *sotto voce*: "Honest citizens—what would a state be without them?"

THE CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

On his way to interview Senator Trim, who was understood to be a likely candidate of his party for President, the reporter reflected that the more public a man is the more private his views are: and that when greater offices and greater issues are at stake, greater taciturnity is practiced by the candidates for these offices. It appears that only issues of little importance or of remote concern could safely be discussed. Opinions shrank as the matters of opinion expanded. He quite expected that the candidate for President would have less to say about national issues than the candidate for mayor or the candidate for governor. Only one political fact of importance was openly to be laid at Senator Trim's door: he was a Republican; and fortunately for himself, he had been for years a big party leader without notoriously committing himself on any policies of large and lasting significance. He could fairly claim the party support; and there was nothing in his record to interfere with his support by any other group, class or faction.

Wishing to have at least one plain answer to a plain question—albeit the question was needless and the answer well known—the reporter began by abruptly asking Senator Trim: "Are you a Republican?" Denial was impossible, but the admission was diplomatic. "Our country," he said with ponderous statesmanlike emphasis, "has developed along the lines of party government; but a narrow and blind partisanship is to be deplored. I can best an-

swer you by saying that I am first of all an American. I am in a broad sense" (the Senator smiled significantly, aware that he was making a good point) "both a democrat and a republican, for I believe in democracy and I believe in the republican form of government. However, no man need blush, as an American patriot, at being known as a member of the party of Abraham Lincoln." Feeling, but dully, the sting of defeat, the reporter lapsed into a formal strain of inquiry. What did Senator Trim think—assuming that he thought—about Prohibition?

"Our government is based upon the Constitution. An English statesman, Gladstone it may have been, once referred to our Declaration of Independence as the mightiest document ever conceived by the mind of man. The same can as truly be said of the Constitution. Taking the two documents together, the result is liberty under the law. Lawlessness is bad. The test of democracy is whether the people observe the laws they make. As for Prohibition, it is largely a social and economic question. I deplore the tendency to confuse such questions in the heat and strife of politics. They should be approached with calmness, with firmness, and with broad-mindedness; they are strictly the business of a President, not a candidate for President. I believe, however, that the opium trade in China should be abolished. There are no two ways of looking at *that* question: the world's honor hangs in the balance."

In reply to a query concerning the oil investigation, the Senator declared: "The Government of the United States is divided into three branches: legislative, executive and judicial. These branches should operate in harmony, not in conflict. The legislative branch

has a right to conduct investigations, although it should do so in a non-political spirit. It is a judicial question. No man should try to interpret or influence the even course of justice. I can best say that I have confidence in the integrity of our courts; while at the same time no man more heartily subscribes to the great principle, 'A public office is a public trust.'"

With regard to Russia, he said: "In attacking property and religion, the Bolsheviks are striking at the two chief bulwarks of Christian civilization. I have no doubt that there is a lot of corruption there. Bad principles breed bad actions."

It was, frankly, his belief that the United States is a good influence in Europe; and that we should stand ready to applaud every real, sincere move toward peace, at the same time not involving ourselves in the possibility of war. "Disarmament," he said, "is splendid as an ideal. Psychologically, we should favor it. The Russians, however, like all extreme radicals, have nothing but a destructive program to offer. If I may say so, what we want is not *destructive* but *constructive* disarmament."

Senator Trim would not discuss the question of farm relief, that is, not in the spirit of political controversy. "There has already been too much political discussion of this question," he said, "and the farmers have not benefited thereby. No right-thinking statesman can fail to realize the importance of the farmers. They raise the country's food supply. They should be helped but they should not be helped in ways that will hinder them. Our foreign trade should be encouraged. We should be proud of the fact

that trade follows the flag. Could better trade follow a better flag?"

The Senator owned to an eager, even an anxious, interest in freedom of the seas. "The seas," he said, "should be the broad, peaceful highways of the nations. There should be no interference with peaceful trade and travel. Yes, I believe absolutely in freedom of the seas—with traffic rules, of course, and with due regard to whatever the circumstances may be, and with the understanding that freedom carries with it responsibilities."

There was no mistaking the soundness of Senator Trim's general outlook on public questions, especially on world questions. Evidently he was, in every sense of the word, a Christian statesman. The reporter didn't bother to ask him what he thought of the Bible. The question would be superfluous. In fact, the Senator had already gone on record in public speeches as a lover of the Bible, the family and the flag. He had also declared epigrammatically: "The ideal citizen is the man who loves God, family and country and in the light of this love and loyalty he cannot go wrong."

More in duty than in hope, the reporter asked Senator Trim if he were definitely a candidate for the presidential nomination. Rising to his full height, and he is a very tall man, the Senator replied loftily: "I can only say that, as a private citizen, I obey the laws; as a Senator, I uphold the Constitution; and as, if and when a candidate for President, I should consider it my duty to enforce the laws officially as strictly as I should observe them personally."

As he left, the reporter inquired: "Senator, what is your opinion of baseball?"

"Ah, it is a great game—that is, for those who like it. At any rate, it is an *American* game. Other things being equal, I believe one can say that baseball is consistent with Christianity, the Constitution and good citizenship."

ADDRESS OF A CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR IN THE SOUTH

Sanford Jarrell

Former Political Reporter and City Editor, The New Orleans Item.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a great pleasure to have the distinguished honor of addressing the splendid citizens and voters of this great city. I feel extremely gratified that so many of you have come here tonight to hear me speak in spite of the bad weather. It shows that the citizens of this fair city of Hammonton, one of the greatest cities in the greatest state in the greatest nation the world has ever known (*applause*) are tired of corruption in public office and want a thorough housecleaning.

I come here as the candidate of the people. Up there in the state capital there sits a man—he sits there about one day a month, I mean; the rest of the time he's out trying to get votes enough to beat me, and you all know he can't do that (*laughter*)—there sits a man with a paunch, sleek, well-nourished and pompous as a rooster, that is seeking reelection by padding the state payrolls at the expense of you taxpayers. Take the State Highway Department for instance. My friends, they have inspectors of sand that never see sand; inspectors of gravel that never see gravel; inspectors of machinery that wouldn't know a road machine if they saw it coming at 'em. And they have supervisors of inspectors, and inspectors of inspectors, and inspectors of inspectors of inspectors, and secretaries of inspectors, and in-

spectors of secretaries of the inspectors. (*Laughter.*) They have so many highway cops steaming up and down the road that you have to get out of your car and ask 'em to get to one side of the road so that you can pass. That's the kind of administration you have now, and the present Governor has the nerve to ask you, the citizens of Hammonton and of our fair Southern state, to continue him in office four years more. If he keeps on appointing sand and gravel inspectors, and highway cops to post pictures of him on road markers, he may have enough people on the payroll to elect him chief executive of a state which by that time will be bankrupt. (*Light applause.*)

Then take the Conservation Department, my friends. Every county in this state has almost as many possum hunters and coon chasers as there are possums and coons. Take the city of Daking Harbor, for instance, with its 100,000 progressive citizens. Ten years ago a coon was found at 1 o'clock in the morning wandering up and down the main street. Last year a "Coonservation" Department snooper got wind of it, and the Governor hired a former prohibition agent at $275 a month to keep the coons out of Daking Harbor. And he gave him a big Cadillac car, and a chauffeur at $150 a month, and all the oil and gas that big car will eat up, just to keep the coons from bothering the people of that great city. (*Laughter.*)

Now, my friends, I have nothing personally against the Governor. He is a splendid gentleman. Nor have I anything against Congressman Cladhome, who also thinks he'd make a wonderful Governor. It's the system I'm fighting, my good friends. Who's back of Cladhome? Who's back of the Governor? None other than that scoundrel, Henry Yazoo John-

son, the biggest rogue yet to be hung. And if either of my two eminent opponents gets to be Governor, who'll run the affairs of this great state? Johnson, of course. And what is Cladhome running on? He's running for Governor on the platform that when he was a boy he used to go about barefooted. But I've got him beat on that. I've employed attorneys and detectives and spies to look up my own record, and just today they sent me a telegram advising me that they had found positive proof that I was born barefooted. (*Laughter.*)

Now this same Honorable Mr. Cladhome has quit the stump to go back to Washington. And why did Johnson and the other managers of his campaign send him back to his office in Washington to let him cock his feet up on his mahogany desk? I'll tell you, my friends. They say he's up there helping to put through some flood control bills. Well, my friends, if Congressman Cladhome is of such value to our fair state up in the national capital, send him back to Congress. That's where he belongs. And he's made a wonderful record there. He's been in Congress fourteen years, and last spring the flood waters were fourteen feet higher than they ever were before. One foot every year he's served in Congress. That's a fine record for a flood statesman, my friends. (*Laughter.*)

Now they tell you about that great big white house I live in in Benton City. I'll tell you about that big white house. Up in Benton City there are some millionaires, mighty fine fellows, most of them. But millionaires sometimes will fall out among themselves. About three years ago, my friends, they had such a falling out, and began to sue each other. One of them hired me as his lawyer, and I fought

the case in the courts, and I won a judgment of $275,000 in one suit, and $125,000 in another. But before that millionaire got his hands on that money I got a whack at it. (*Laughter.*)

I then paid all my debts and I had some left, and I went to an architect and I told him to build me a great big white house on the hill and make it look as much like the First National Bank as a house could. And he did. Now the First National Bank has an iron railing about it, so I had me an iron railing too. And the bank has gilt letters, "F. N. B.," over the gate, each letter a foot high. So I had me some gilt letters two feet high, my own initials, put over my gate.

That's how I got that big white house on the hill at Benton City, my friends. I hope my millionaire friends in Benton City never fall out again, but if they do I'm going to catch the first train home. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Friends, after you elect me Governor you're going to see some amazing things done. You take that big payroll the Governor's got now. When you hear I've been inaugurated Governor, you get into your automobiles and start for the capital. When you get to the state house you just see how many of them rascals is left on the payroll. (*Laughter.*)

And there's another thing, my friends. I'm going to give the school children of this state free text-books. (*Applause.*) They say I can't find the money for them. Just you wait and see if I can't find the money lying about somewhere in the state treasury. I'm going to cut $400,000 a month graft off the state payroll, and then you folks see if I haven't got enough money to give the white children of this great state the best text-books that money will buy.

There's nothing too good for our children and the money that now is being squandered by a lot of selfish politicians and incompetent political job-holders will be altogether devoted to making this a better state to live in. (*Applause.*)

I'm going to purge this great state of corruption and greed. (*Applause.*) I'm going to make it decent. That's what you women want. The women of this state are the finest women of the world, true noblewomen of God. (*Applause.*) They deserve to have their children live in decent surroundings, untainted by the filth of our present-day politics. (*Applause.*) And I want to tell you noble mothers of children that you can always come to the Governor's office when I'm Governor and lay your troubles before me. There won't be any watchdog in the outer office to keep you out, like there is now. The latchstring will be always out. And you won't have to hustle to the state house before 4 o'clock in the afternoon, either. I'm going to work overtime every day, for there'll be lots of overtime needed to clean house in this state. You come right up to see me, and you'll find me an attentive listener, for I'll be the first Governor in many years who realizes that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. (*Applause.*)

That reminds me of a meeting held not long ago in a nigger church up in the northern part of the state. It was one of those testimonial meetings, in which all the brethren and sistern (*mild laughter*) got up and told what the good Lord had done for them. The good Lord had cured them of sin and chilbains, of devil worship and hookworm and swamp fever. Then finally the preacher called out to one of the flock sitting at the back of the room.

"Brother Jones, what's de good Lawd done foh you?"

Brother Jones got up slowly and clumsily on his crutches.

"Well, pahson," he said, "I'se done got tapeworm, foah ribs broke, a crick in mah neck, bunions on dese po' foot an' de misery in mah back. Ah'm heah tuh say, reverend, dat de good Lawd have left me in one hell of a fix." (*Riotous laughter.*)

Friends, they call me a demagogue because I'm a friend of the working man. Call me a demagogue if you wish, but I want to go on record as saying—and I don't care who knows it—that when I'm Governor the interests of the working man and farmer will come first with me. (*Prolonged applause.*) I'm a friend of capital, too. If the working man and the farmer are prosperous, the capitalist, the banker, the manufacturer, the merchant and the professional man are prosperous as well. I won't sleep nights until everybody in this state is prosperous and happy, enjoying life as God meant them to. (*Applause.*) I'll bring new factories here to aid the working man, and I'll reduce taxes to aid the farmer.

I'll show you, my good friends, another instance of how this state is woefully mismanaged by the present administration. There is the state prison farm. And the penitentiary factories. They have free land and free labor and no taxes. And yet each year the penitentiary and prison farm have a deficit of nearly one million dollars. The farmers who haven't got free land, and haven't got free labor, and who pay high taxes, have to make the soil turn out a profit for them. If I can't make the prison farm and penitentiary factories make money for the state, then I'm going to close

'em down, and I'll engage the best rooms in the swellest hotels in this state and house the convicts there, and still save money for the state. (*Applause and laughter.*)

My friends, there's a lot that can be done right here in Hammonton. This fair city is going to have a state tuberculosis hospital that we've needed for a long, long time. (*Applause.*) The hospital would have been built years ago if the politicians had not wasted the people's money. I'm going to start building that hospital in this great city the first week I'm Governor. (*Loud applause.*) I want to make it possible for every unfortunate man, woman and child afflicted with that dread disease to come out here in the pine woods and have the care of the best doctors and nurses that money can afford. And it won't cost them a cent! It is a duty that we owe them, and nowhere in this state can be found a location as healthful as right here in this county, and right here is where I'm going to build that hospital. (*Applause.*)

Then there's another thing I want to talk about. I came here by automobile today from Burlingame over Highway No. 7. The Highway Department has just spent $75,000 on that highway for maintenance. Most of it went for gravel, and the gravel was all bought from men who are supporting the Governor. I smell a mouse there. Who's paying the expenses of the Governor's campaign, anyway? And what kind of gravel was this? A lot of sand with a few pebbles thrown in, and bought at al most double the current market price bid by owners of pits who aren't in politics, or who are supporting me for Governor. And the chairman of the Highway Commission tells you he rejected these other bids because their

gravel wasn't up to specifications. Just ride out on Highway No. 7 and see what kind of gravel they say is up to specifications, my friends. When I'm Governor that's another kind of graft that's going to stop, and I'm going to put concrete on that road, and you can take your friends from the North out for a spin in the country and not have to apologize for it. That's another thing I'm going to do for Hammonton when I'm Governor. (*Applause.*) And you can go back over my public record and if you can find a single promise I've ever made that I didn't fulfill, except where the ring politicians balked me, I'll withdraw from this race and go back to Benton City and hide my head in the wood-pile back of my house and not come out until I look like Rip Van Winkle. (*Laughter and applause.*)

The lying newspapers supporting the Governor and Cladhome—these two fine, upstanding gentlemen are alike as two peas in a pod, and the gang bosses don't care which one is elected—these prostituted and subsidized journals say that the other day in the lobby of a hotel in the metropolis I poked Henry Yazoo Johnson in the face and then ran away from him. Do you want to know what really happened, my friends? I wouldn't dirty my hands on that foul ball, and ordinarily I wouldn't be seen talking to him any more than I'd be seen talking to a bootlegger, a gambler or a highway policeman. But he collared me in the lobby, and I told him to take his filthy paws off me. He made a pass at me, but I warded off the blow, and told him to be on his way. He struck at me again, so there was only one thing for me to do, and that was to smack him in the jaw, which I did. (*Applause.*) He ran like a scared calf, and I was so mad by this

time that I thought one more jolt on the chin would do his mangy soul good. So I took after him, but a cop stopped me. The next morning the lying *Gazette-News* and the scandal-mongering *Times-Tribune* had to cook up the story to suit their own ends.

My friends, you can take a little calf, and after awhile he will stop sucking and wean himself. You can take the lowest kind of razorback hog, and they will stop sucking when they're about nine weeks old, and so go to rooting for themselves. But you can't wean a bunch of pap-sucking and pie-eating politicians. The only thing you can do is to bury them. We buried them once, some years ago, but we made the mistake of burying them face up, so they scratched their way to the surface. This time we're going to bury 'em face down, and every time they scratch they'll move one inch closer to Hell where they all belong. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Now, my good friends of Hammonton, I don't want you to think I'm given to boasting, but I want to tell you of just one thing I did for the metropolis of this state. If it hadn't been for me, that metropolis would be about the poorest port in the South, instead of one of the great ports of the world. The so-called Hollowell rate case had been lost up in Washington, and it looked like all the freight would go to the Hollowell port, instead of to our own magnificent port. So a committee was formed, of all the leading bankers and business men and steamship kings and railway executives of this state. And who did they call upon to come down and lead that fight? They called on me, and I came down, and I led the delegation to Washington. For over a year I fought for the metropolis, fought for the life-blood

of that magnificent port, and I didn't take a cent in fees. And when the battle was over, we won a tremendous victory.

My enemies will tell you that during that fight in Washington I spent most of my time in New York drinking and going to the theaters and cabarets and having a good time at the gambling hells that abound in that wicked city. That, my friends, is the kind of a muck-raking campaign of lies they are making against me. I am a member in good standing of the First Baptist Church of Benton City. I go there regularly. I have never taken a drop of liquor in my life, and I don't know what the stuff tastes like. I have always been for the strict enforcement of the prohibition amendment, and if I'm Governor I'm going to cram down the wet throats of the Legislature, especially the wet throats of the senators and representatives sent to the capital by the bootleg-gambling-racing ring of the metropolis, a state Volstead Act with teeth in it.

I also am bitterly opposed to the domination of any foreign element, such as control the gang politics in our largest cities. I believe in 100 percent Americanism as the only creed worth while. The standards laid down by our forefathers, by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee are good enough for me. (*Applause.*)

And when I'm Governor of this great commonwealth there'll be no monkey business in the public schools. (*Applause.*) I'm no fanatic, but you can't make me believe that my grandfather hung down from the limb of a cottonwood tree by his tail. (*Laughter.*) And no highbrow atheist is going to tell me that the Bible is a joke-book, a ribald piece

of writing conceived only to be scoffed at. (*Applause.*) The Holy Bible is the Word of God, and as such it will be respected when I'm Governor, or these Bolsheviks will think a typhoon has struck 'em. (*Applause.*) And I don't want anybody to think I'm against freedom of religious worship. I believe that every man should be allowed to worship as he pleases, but as I said before I won't stand for any monkey business.

In conclusion, my friends, let me say that if you want a clean administration and a progressive administration vote for me; if you want a business man for Governor, vote for me; if you want Hammonton to grow by leaps and bounds, and take her rightful place among the great cities of this fair Southland of ours, vote for me. But, my friends, if you want the thugs and gangsters and race-track gamblers and bootleggers and cabaret hounds of the more sordid spots in the state, and their crooked allies in some of the smaller towns and cities, to run things as they have been running things, then vote for either one of the two gentlemen who are opposing me, and may God have mercy on your souls. (*Prolonged applause. Band strikes up "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow."*)

IS REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT BREAKING DOWN IN AMERICA?

Clay Fulks

All past governments in the history of the world—from petty tribunal governments to the mightiest of empires—were foredoomed to failure and extinction. The efforts of men to establish and maintain political governments that could, or would, be suffered to endure for long have been signally unsuccessful. The stream of history is thickly strewn with their wrecks. It has seemed to make but little difference, so far as its chance for survival were concerned, whether a given government was democratic, aristocratic, or autocratic; whether it was mild and liberal or rigorous and stern; whether set up by common consent or by superior force—it moved straight and inexorably toward catastrophe.

The tenure of a few governments has, by superior statesmanship, by favorable external circumstances, or, sometimes, by the downright inertia and worthlessness of their subjects, been prolonged far beyond the average; but finally insurrection from within or invasion from without overcame them. Perhaps history affords no example of a government on any extensive scale that could accurately be described as at once just and orderly. Perhaps no such government would be permitted to endure for long; there are too many powerful men to whom any serious efforts to establish such a government would be an impertinence and an obstruction. The fate of the Gracchi and the result of their efforts furnish a classic

illustration of this. And that example, when allowances are made for variations, might be multiplied a thousand times. The political Jeremiahs have always been able to descry impending disaster, and sooner or later disaster comes. The prophecies of political doom have ever been fulfilled. All of which may be trite and platitudinous, but it is a fundamental fact, nevertheless.

Yet instead of giving up the job in disgust and despair, the optimistic Jacks of the political trade pride themselves on their achievements in both the science and the art of political government. Governments are toppled over that "better" ones may be built in their places. The Babylons that fell "to rise no more" have always risen again on other shores or under fairer skies. The prophecies of renaissance and rehabilitation have likewise been fulfilled.

The politicians, practical and philosophical, have exercised commendable and amusing ingenuity in their attempts to establish and maintain enduring political structures. But permanence, not justice, has been the primary end to which they have aimed. Anciently—in fact until recently—they set up solemn and insistent claims to sanctity in behalf of their governments. *Their* political institutions had been inspected and approved by God Himself. In fact, they were in league with Him. No matter, then, how corrupt and rotten; how incompetent and unjust; how oppressive and preposterous a government might be, it could not be opposed without opposing God. And that was something awful. It was soon discovered, however, that when such a government *had* been overthrown, God appeared quite willing to approve and bless the one erected in its place. Whatever government was able to exist,

then, was the divinely approved one. And so deeply was this doctrine of divine approval of government stamped into the minds of men that the foolish fiction persists even yet.

Even in America today no Congress or State Legislature would dare uncork its corruption without having a man of God employed to intercede for it at the Throne of Grace. And though God is not recognized in our Federal Constitution, few patriotic Americanos, put under oath, would hesitate to testify to their belief that this government, among all the governments of the earth today, is God's favorite. It is tacitly in league with Him. But its tenure could be vastly lengthened and strengthened, in the well-considered opinion of multitudes of those who mix piety with their patriotism, if God's supreme authority were formally and expressly acknowledged in the Federal Constitution; it would likely help immensely in maintaining that beautiful *entente cordiale* existing between Uncle Sam and Jehovah if the latter were only given honorable mention in that noted but neglected document. As it is, He is probably peeved.

Brother Bryan had taken notice of this and had announced his intention of getting this diplomatic tangle adjusted but he was called to New Jerusalem before he could get it done. He should have attended to that while he was Secretary of State. Possibly, however, it was in connection with this matter that he was summoned to New Jerusalem so suddenly, and he may have the whole thing settled by now. Perhaps the Reverends John Roach Straton and W. B. Riley, Wizard Evans, and possibly even the Reverend "Baby Ben" Bogard have been advised as to whether our organic law will have to be amended if we are to continue to abound

in grace. I am led into this digression from my subject by my patriotic anxiety that strained relations between Washington and New Jerusalem be avoided. But I must return.

* * *

Is republican government breaking down in America? Possibly not; probably so. Certainly, there are symptoms, clearly observable, of such a breakdown.

It is an old but loud-sounding boast in this country that every American citizen is an uncrowned sovereign; every man Jack of them, and now every Jill, is a king or a queen *sans* the head-gear. Spread-eagle orators used to bestride this theme at crossroad celebrations and soar to lofty heights; we don't hear so much about it of late. Well, half or more of these uncrowned sovereigns have abdicated. They have turned utterly deaf ears to the eloquent bellowings and patriotic hey-diddle-diddles of the civic leaders and politicians, and regularly refuse to vote. Perhaps half of those who do vote doubt seriously that it is worth while. A year or two ago the Strong Man in the White House thought it necessary to administer a rebuke to that half of the nation which refuses to vote; and the rebuke has been amplified and echoed by the political spouters all over the country; but like all other regular politicians, he is extremely careful not to raise any issues worth voting on. Evidently, what the Coolidges want is votes for the Coolidges.

It is not strange that so few citizens vote. Actually, it is amazing that so many of them do vote, considering what is offered them to vote for. As a matter of fact, most of them go to the polls because they have a personal friend or two, or a debtor, on the tail end of

the ticket; and being there voting, decide that they might as well vote for Cox or Harding, Davis or Coolidge. With the rest, an election is a sporting event and the boys want to help the horses they are backing. It would be hard to say which is the more futile to the earnest and intelligent citizen: voting on the fake issues raised in a national campaign or voting on the fake statesmen up for election. Victor Berger was not flippant when he suggested in the campaign of 1920 that Harding and Cox throw dice for the presidency.

* * *

Not only are no worthwhile issues presented to the electorate and few honest and capable candidates put forward but, what is cause for deeper concern, the country seems perfectly satisfied about it. Indeed that is why no issues of any consequence are raised and why so few honest, capable men offer themselves as candidates for office—they are not wanted. A political party putting forward a serious statement of principles and a programme worth considering would instantly become an object of general, malicious, and vituperative assault, and its leaders would be lucky if they were not manhandled or prosecuted. Citizens could hardly meet now to discuss vital issues in straightforward fashion without being guilty of "criminal conspiracy." The "uncrowned sovereigns" will not tolerate the raising of vital issues, and an honest candidate is regarded as a freak.

And herein a danger of distressing magnitude. There has been fixed in the American mind the idea that the "American political system" is something sacrosanct, something that should stand forever final and immutable. To question it in any particular is like disputing

the Decalogue. Any new political idea is "un-American" and therefore treasonable, and the attempt to propagate such an idea is highly criminal. Such "un-American propaganda" should be sternly dealt with by law and when the law lags in this function it becomes the plain duty of "loyal" Americans to take whatever extra-legal steps to stamp out the incipient "insurrection" the exigencies of the occasion seem to require.

If it takes a tarpot and a bag of feathers to save the state. why, who counts the cost of a coat of tar-and-feathers? The president's toes must be kissed, and no seditious questions must be asked. Rather than see the "American political system" adjusted to a changing world, the "loyal" Americans would force a wayward world to adapt itself to a changeless political system—the Procrustean bed of American politics must not be tinkered with. This national superstition, masquerading as the only loyalty to the American government, may be flamboyantly panegyrized by dolts and demagogues; but this superstition alone, if allowed to run rampant on and on, will suffice to gum up the whole works and wreck the very system it aims to protect. For there is a loyalty higher than the loyalty due any particular political system—loyalty to the larger interests of society and the fundamental rights of the individual. And this higher loyalty will not ultimately be denied.

* * *

While this state of affairs was arising, civil liberty in America was being outraged a thousand times a day and nobody cared—nobody except a few Reds and a few old-school libertarians. The reason *they* cared, of course, was because they were "criminals." Nothing seems

quite so obnoxious to the hundred-percent American as the spirit of liberty and there seems to be no lengths to which he is not willing to go in order to suppress it. Are hundred percenters themselves worthy of liberty. Virtually, they admit they are not.

Many blue-nosed moralists are dreadfully alarmed at the "crime wave" sweeping the country; some of them are even trembling for the stability of the Republic. But how many of them are interested in any scientific study of the fundamental *causes* of crime? How many of them are willing to admit that the government of the United States itself, in betraying the nation into the World War, committed the most colossal crime ever perpetrated on the Western hemisphere? When Uncle Sam himself ran amok and began blackjacking, jailing and otherwise harassing honest men because they were honest, what was to be expected of a million morons infected with the idea of lawlessness?

When, in 1917, I remarked to an elderly lawyer that this country was in for a reign of lawlessness such as it had never known before, he looked at me in pained and puzzled amazement, shook his head sadly, and wondered how I could be so cruelly cynical as to question the holiness of the crusade just launched against the Hun and his devilish works. And how many of our horrible moralists can see that the armed authorities of the State and Federal governments are running the other criminals of the country a neck-and-neck race in the commission of crime? But who cares how many outrages and atrocities are perpetrated in the name and by the authority of hundred percentism?

I have seen boys charged with simple mis-

demeanors shot down by police officers with impunity, of course. The community in which it occurred was not even shocked. Men admittedly innocent of crime, except the "crime" of holding unpopular opinions, have rotted in American jails without arousing one cheep of general protest. Indeed, the Goddess of Liberty has been outraged so many times in this country since the world was made safe for democracy, and with such perfect impunity, that she has lost about all the reputation for chastity she ever had. Even now it is bad, bad form to mention her name in respectable circles. Only a few fellows, such as Roger Baldwin, are rude enough to do so.

* * *

Another system of the breaking down of republican government in this country is the perfect ease with which the plunderous plans of American imperialists are being put over. Who cares a fig what American marines do in Latin America—or anywhere else, for that matter? Who cares a continental how many private, Punic wars are waged abroad in behalf of American investors and exploiters? This attitude of stolid indifference to any conquests of "undeveloped" weaker nations which their nationals may care to undertake is historically characteristic of those nations whose governments were passing through that familiar transition from republicanism to empire; and all that palaver about "manifest destiny" and "benevolence" is given the final finishing touch of ironic humor by the spectacle of Uncle Sam's sending marines into Nicaragua to insure honest elections! If the gods are not roaring with merriment over that performance, then, certainly gods never laugh at the antics of men.

The vast amount of fraud and corruption in

American public life is certainly serious enough yet it is less serious as a symptom of the breaking down of republican government than the general, almost universal, indifference with which it is regarded. The current record of the Republican party in this respect would damn it to utter annihilation in any country having ordinary respect for civic decency; but it cannot even be confidently predicted that the Republicans will lose the pending campaign. Indeed, I suspect that the Republicans could elect even Harry Daugherty president. There is nobody with clean hands to oppose them. There may be a few men in this country—say, Democrats in the hills of Tennessee and North Georgia—who are simple enough to be hornswoggled into believing that if the Republican "rascals" were kicked out by the Democrats, their places would be filled by honester men, but such innocents don't control the elections. So why *should* the Republicans be dislodged? Personally speaking, I believe I'd trust Old Harry about one-tenth of a millimeter further than I would Mitchell Palmer. Harry did have the decency to resign and his closest pal had the decency to shoot himself, but not much can be said for Mitchell Palmer and his pirate crew.

Clearly, American history owes apologies to the shades of Captain Kidd and Benedict Arnold.

* * *

All governments stand in constant need of repairs, reformations, and readjustments, and when these changes are not allowed to be effected progressively and as they are needed, there comes a time when they will be done violently and abruptly. Even a single major vice, persisted in too far, may result in the overthrow of a government.

Unless, then, the government of this country can effect a radical change of spirit, of attitude, and of purpose, a steady weakening of faith in its honesty and capacity is bound to occur; a steady loss of respect for and allegiance to it is simply inevitable. Governments exist by sufferance and during "good" behavior. By the increasing abuses of power on the one hand and the non-use of power on the other, this government seems to be indifferent to the respect of its honest citizens. It will probably attempt with increasing rigor and severity to repair this loss of respect and allegiance, as stupid governments historically have done, by enacting a mass of punitive, revengeful legislation—anti-syndicalist, anti-sedition, and espionage laws of every imaginable sort and description.

Yet, unfortunately for the future welfare of this nation, there appears hardly a remote hope for a normal, healthful revolution; indeed, the signs point in the opposite direction. About the next time a national "emergency" arises some Mussolini, booted and spurred, will swagger into the White House, stamp his huge feet, rattle his saber, and we will discreetly acknowledge ourselves loyal subjects of a dictator.

Wherefore, this bill of exceptions; and hence these resentments, hence these tears.